REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5-14, 17-29, and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over FORD et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0289140) and DOGANATA et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220913); and objects to claims 15 and 16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 15 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claim, but respectfully traverse the rejection.[1]

By way of the present amendment, Applicants amend claim 28 to improve form and add new claims 35-43. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendment. Claims 1-3, 5-29, and 31-43 are pending.

At the outset, the Examiner appears to rely solely on FORD et al. for the rejection of independent claims 1, 8-10, 28, and 29. For example, with regard to claim 1, the Examiner states that FORD et al. does not disclose that the identified source is a news source and further states that DOGANATA et al. discloses this feature (final Office Action, pg. 3). However, claims 1, 8-10, 28, and 29 do not recite that the identified source is a news source. Applicants respectfully request clarification of the rejection of the independent claims.

Claims 1-3, 5-14, 17-29, and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

---

[1] As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, reasons to modify a reference and/or combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

unpatentable over FORD et al. in view of DOGANATA et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 is directed toward a method performed by one or more devices. The method includes receiving a list of links; identifying, for at least one of the links, a source with which the at least one link is associated; and ranking the list of links based at least in part on a quality of the identified source, the ranking including: retrieving a source rank value for each identified source, the source rank value being based at least in part on one or more of a number of articles produced by the identified source during a first time period, an average length of an article produced by the identified source, an amount of coverage that the identified source produces in a second time period, a breaking news score, network traffic to the identified source, a human opinion of the identified source, circulation statistics of the identified source, a size of a staff associated with the identified source, a number of bureaus associated with the identified source, a number of original named entities in a group of articles associated with the identified source, a breadth of coverage by the identified source, a number of different countries from which traffic to the identified source originates, or a writing style used by the identified source. FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al. do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest ranking a list of links based at least in part on a quality of an source with which the link is associated, where the ranking includes retrieving a source rank value for each identified source, the source rank value being based at least in part on one or more of a number of articles produced by the

identified source during a first time period, an average length of an article produced by the identified source, an amount of coverage that the identified source produces in a second time period, a breaking news score, network traffic to the identified source, a human opinion of the identified source, circulation statistics of the identified source, a size of a staff associated with the identified source, a number of bureaus associated with the identified source, a number of original named entities in a group of articles associated with the identified source, a breadth of coverage by the identified source, a number of different countries from which traffic to the identified source originates, or a writing style used by the identified source. The Examiner appears to rely on reference 170 and paragraphs 0033 and 0061 of FORD et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 3). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of FORD et al.

Reference 170 of FORD et al. discloses a product score associated with each indexed web page in a Product Spider Database (paragraph 0034). Product score 170 is assigned to a web page based on the <u>likelihood that the web site offers a product for sale</u> (paragraph 0037). FORD et al. does not disclose or suggest that product score 170 is based on at least one of a number of articles produced by the identified source during a first time period, an average length of an article produced by the identified source, an amount of coverage that the identified source produces in a second time period, a breaking news score, network traffic to the identified source, a human opinion of the identified source, circulation statistics of the identified source, a size of a staff associated with the identified source, a number of bureaus associated with the identified source, a number of original named entities in a group of articles associated with the identified

source, a breadth of coverage by the identified source, a number of different countries

from which traffic to the identified source originates, or a writing style used by the

identified source, as recited in claim 1. Thus, FORD et al.'s product score 170 cannot

reasonably be construed as the recited source rank value.

At paragraph 0033, FORD et al. discloses:

> The query server 140 includes a category ranking process 150 that prioritizes, by
> category, the results of searches across all of the various databases 141-147. The
> prioritization scheme is based upon an assessment of the significance of each
> category to the search query submitted by the user. The query server 140 also
> includes a spell checker 152 for detecting and correcting misspellings in search
> attempts, and a search tool 154 capable of generating search results from a
> database (e.g. the Books database 141) in response to a query submitted by a
> user. The search tool 154 prioritizes the items within a search result using
> different criteria depending upon the database used for the search. One approach,
> used for the Product Spider database 147, ranks the search result items through
> the well known "term frequency inverse document frequency" (TFIDF)
> approach, in which the weighting applied to each term of a multiple-term query is
> inversely related to the term's frequency of appearance in the database. In other
> words, the term in a query that appears least often in a database (e.g. the Product
> Spider database 147) is considered to be the most discriminating term in the
> query, and thus is given the greatest weight by the search tool 154. Algorithms
> for implementing this approach are well known and are commonly available in
> software development kits associated with commercial search engines such
> ALTAVISTA and EXCITE.

This section of FORD et al. discloses that the query server 140 includes a category

ranking process 150 that prioritizes, by category, the results of searches across all of the

various databases 141-147. One approach ranks search result items in a category based

on the "term frequency inverse document frequency" (TFIDF) approach, in which the

weighting applied to each term of a multiple-term query is inversely related to the term's

frequency of appearance in the database. This section of FORD et al. does not mention

ranking based on a <u>quality of a source with which a link is associated</u>. Therefore, this

section of FORD et al. cannot disclose or suggest ranking a list of links based at least in

part on a quality of an identified source, the ranking including retrieving a source rank

value for each identified source, the source rank value being based at least in part on one or more of a number of articles produced by the identified source during a first time period, an average length of an article produced by the identified source, an amount of coverage that the identified source produces in a second time period, a breaking news score, network traffic to the identified source, a human opinion of the identified source, circulation statistics of the identified source, a size of a staff associated with the identified source, a number of bureaus associated with the identified source, a number of original named entities in a group of articles associated with the identified source, a breadth of coverage by the identified source, a number of different countries from which traffic to the identified source originates, or a writing style used by the identified source, as required by claim 1.

At paragraph 0061, FORD et al. discloses that a search tool may use product score values (indicative of the likelihood that the corresponding web pages contain products available for purchase) stored in the Product Spider Database to assist in the prioritization of the results generated from the Product Spider Database. More specifically, this section of FORD et al. discloses ranking results in one category based on the <u>likelihood that web pages contain products available for purchase.</u> This section of FORD et al. does not disclose or suggest ranking a list of links based at least in part on a quality of an source with which the link is associated, the ranking including retrieving a source rank value for each identified source, the source rank value being based at least in part on <u>one or more of a number of articles produced by the identified source during a first time period, an average length of an article produced by the identified source, an amount of coverage that the identified source produces in a second time period, a breaking news score, network</u>

traffic to the identified source, a human opinion of the identified source, circulation statistics of the identified source, a size of a staff associated with the identified source, a number of bureaus associated with the identified source, a number of original named entities in a group of articles associated with the identified source, a breadth of coverage by the identified source, a number of different countries from which traffic to the identified source originates, or a writing style used by the identified source, as required by claim 1. Thus, FORD et al.'s product score cannot reasonably be construed as equivalent to the recited source rank value.

On page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that FORD et al. "teaches the popularity levels (i.e., numbers of retrieving articles in a period of time or network traffic to the identified source)" and relies on the abstract of FORD et al. for support. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The abstract of FORD et al. discloses generating, for each of multiple categories, a score that reflects a level of significance of the category to the search, where the scores may be based on the number of hits within each category relative to a total number of items in that category or the popularity levels of items that satisfy the query. Specifically, this section of FORD et al. discloses generating scores for categories based on the popularity levels of items that satisfy a query. This section of FORD et al. does not mention ranking a list of links based at least in part on a quality of a source with which a link is associated, as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner further relies on Fig. 5 and paragraphs 0068-0069 (which describe Fig. 5) of DOGANATA et al. as allegedly disclosing ranking information sources based on source score (Office Action, pg. 10). Applicants respectfully disagree with the

Examiner's interpretation of DOGANATA et al.

Figure 5 of DOGANATA et al. depicts a representation of how information sources are scored and ranked. The total score of a source is the addition of each of the keyword scores (paragraph 0069). While this figure of DOGANATA et al. depicts source score and source rank values, DOGANATA et al. in no way discloses or suggests ranking a list of links based at least in part on the information source score of the information source with which a link is associated, as would be required by claim 1 based on the Examiner's interpretation of DOGANATA et al.

In paragraphs 0068-0069, DOGANATA et al. discloses determining an average document score for an information source by dividing a total information source score by a number of documents returned. The information source is scored determined by adding keyword scores for all keywords in a category. While this section of DOGANATA et al. discloses source score and source rank values, DOGANATA et al. in no way discloses or suggests ranking a list of links based at least in part on the information source score of the information source with which a link is associated, as would be required by claim 1 based on the Examiner's interpretation of DOGANATA et al. Therefore, this section of DOGANATA et al. does not disclose or suggest ranking a list of links based at least in part on a quality of an source associated with a link, the ranking including retrieving a source rank value for each identified source, the source rank value being based at least in part on one or more of a number of articles produced by the identified source during a first time period, an average length of an article produced by the identified source, an amount of coverage that the identified source produces in a second time period, a breaking news score, network traffic to the identified source, a human opinion of the

identified source, circulation statistics of the identified source, a size of a staff associated with the identified source, a number of bureaus associated with the identified source, a number of original named entities in a group of articles associated with the identified source, a breadth of coverage by the identified source, a number of different countries from which traffic to the identified source originates, or a writing style used by the identified source, as recited in claim 1.

Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that the above section of DOGANATA et al. could be reasonably construed as disclosing the above feature of claim 1 (a point that Applicants do not concede), the Examiner has not explained why one skilled in the art at the time of Applicants' invention would have been motivated to incorporate this alleged feature of DOGANATA et al. into the FORD et al. system. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with regard to claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-7 depend from claim 1. Therefore, these claims are allowable over FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al.

For example, claim 6 recites that the links include links to on-line news articles. The Examiner relies on reference number 380 in Fig. 3 and paragraphs 0041, 0056 (which describes reference number 380), 0069, and 0099 of FORD et al. as allegedly

disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 6). Applicants respectfully disagree with the

Examiner's interpretation of FORD et al.

At paragraph 0041, FORD et al. discloses:

> If the query is submitted to a single category, the search engine will present to the user a query results page (or multiple pages linked by hypertext, if the search finds a large number of items) containing a list of items matching the query. The search results page includes, for each item found, a hypertext link to additional web pages containing, among other things, product information about the item.

This section of FORD et al. discloses presenting a query results page containing a list of

items matching a query and, for each item found, a hyptertext link to additional web

pages containing product information about the item. This section of FORD et al. does

not mention on-line news articles. Therefore, this section of FORD et al. cannot disclose

or suggest that the links include links to on-line news articles, as recited in claim 6.

In paragraph 0056, FORD et al. discloses:

> Immediately below the Additional Matches section 350, the results page displays the Related Products section 380. This section displays the search results generated from application of the query to the unaffiliated merchant database, that is, to the Product Spider database 147. In the preferred embodiment, no top-level results are displayed for this category. Instead, the results are accessible from the All Products search results page 300 via a hypertext link labeled "Related Products" 380. The search of the Product Spider database 147 preferably does not take place simultaneously with the searches of the other databases 141-146. Rather, the Product Spider search is initiated by the user's selection of the Related Products hypertext link 380, instead of by the user's selection of the search initiation button 240.

This section of FORD et al. discloses a related products section 380 that displays the

search results generated from application of a query to an unaffiliated merchant database.

This section of FORD et al. does not disclose or suggest that the links include links to on-

line news articles, as required in claim 6.

In paragraph 0069, FORD et al. discloses:

> The analysis is conducted on a page by page basis, with each web page being assessed independently. In an alternative embodiment, a target page may be

> assessed by analyzing, in addition to the content of the target page itself, the contents of other web pages linked to the target page. The analysis may be limited to "neighboring" web pages (i.e., web pages directly accessible via a link on the target page), or it may extend to encompass more remotely accessible web pages (i.e., web pages that are only accessible via a series of links). In these embodiments, the contributions of other web pages to the assessment of the target page may be weighted such that the influence of a remote page decreases with the number of links between the page and the target page, and/or such that only web pages of the same web site are considered.

This section of FORD et al. discloses that a target page may be assessed by analyzing, in addition to the content of the target page itself, the contents of other web pages linked to the target page. This section of FORD et al. does not mention on-line news articles.

Therefore, this section of FORD et al. cannot disclose or suggest that the links include links to on-line news articles, as recited in claim 6.

> In paragraph 0099, FORD et al. discloses:

> As noted above, users of the AMAZON.COM web site 130 may conduct an All Products search that will generate results for items directly offered for sale by the AMAZON.COM web site (organized into multiple categories), items offered for sale by third parties (Auction and zShop users) using the Amazon web site as a forum, items offered for sale by other on-line merchants affiliated with AMAZON.COM (organized into multiple categories), and items offered for sale by on-line merchants unaffiliated with AMAZON.COM (those within the Product Spider database 147). With such a large number of categories involved, it is advantageous that the results of such a cross-category search be displayed efficiently. In particular, it is desirable that the search results of most relevance to the user be displayed so that the user does not need to wade through a long list of irrelevant search results or click through a long series of hypertext links to find the results of greatest interest.

This section of FORD et al. discloses displaying the search results of most relevance to a user so that the user does not need to wade through a long list of irrelevant search results or click through a long series of hypertext links to find the results of greatest interest. This section of FORD et al. does not mention on-line news articles. Therefore, this section of FORD et al. cannot disclose or suggest that the links include links to on-line news articles, as recited in claim 6.

On page 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that "Ford teaches a hypertext link to additional web pages containing, among other things, product information about the item." Regardless of the accuracy of the Examiner's statement, FORD et al. does not disclose that the links include links to on-line news articles, as recited in claim 6.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 6 is patentable over FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Independent claims 8-11 and 27-29 recite features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 8-11 and 27-29 are patentable over FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 32 depends from claim 8. Therefore, claim 32 is patentable over FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 8. Moreover, claim 32 recites additional features not disclosed or suggested by FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al.

For example, claim 32 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 6. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 32 is patentable over FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 6.

Claim 33 depends from claim 9. Therefore, claim 33 is patentable over FORD et

al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 9. Moreover, claim 33 recites additional features not disclosed or suggested by FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al.

For example, claim 33 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 6. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 33 is patentable over FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 6.

Claims 12-14 and 17-26 depend from claim 11. Therefore, these claims are allowable over FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 11. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al.

For example, claim 21 recites repeating the determining and generating for a plurality of other sources, at least one of the plurality of other sources including a different news source, and storing the quality values for the new source and the plurality of other sources. The Examiner relies on reference 167, paragraph 0010, and paragraph 0034 of FORD et al. as allegedly disclosing these features (Office Action, pg. 7). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of FORD et al.

Reference 167 of FORD et al. represents one or more web page addresses stored in the Product Spider database (paragraphs 0088-0089). Reference 167 of FORD et al. does not disclose a news source, let alone a plurality of different news sources. Therefore, reference 167 of FORD et al. does not disclose or suggest repeating the

determining and generating for a plurality of other sources, at least one of the plurality of other sources including a different news source, and storing the quality values for the new source and the plurality of other sources, as recited in claim 21.

At paragraph 0010, FORD et al. discloses:

> Another feature of the invention involves a system and methods for assisting users in locating web sites or pages from which user-specified products can be purchased. In a preferred embodiment, each web page located by a crawler program is initially evaluated, according to a set of content-based rules, to generate a score that indicates a likelihood that the web page includes a product offering. The scores may additionally be based on other criteria, such as the content of other web pages of the same web site. Representations of some or all of the scored web pages are stored in a keyword index that maps keywords to addresses (URLs) of the web pages. The keyword index is used by a query server to locate web pages that are both relevant to a user's search query and likely to include a product offering. This may be accomplished, for example, by limiting a scope of the search to web pages having a score that satisfies a particular threshold.

This section of FORD et al. discloses using a crawler to assist users in locating web sites or pages from which user-specified products can be purchased. This section of FORD et al. does not disclose a news source, let alone a plurality of different news sources. Therefore, this section of FORD et al. does not disclose or suggest repeating the determining and generating for a plurality of other sources, at least one of the plurality of other sources including a different news source, and storing the quality values for the new source and the plurality of other sources, as recited in claim 21.

At paragraph 0034, FORD et al. discloses:

> The Product Spider database 147 is generated through the use of a web crawler 160 that crawls web sites on the Internet 120 while storing copies of located web pages. The output of the web crawler 160 is input to a product score generator 162 that assigns a numerical score ("product score") to each web page based upon the likelihood that the page offers a product for sale for either online or offline purchase. For purposes of generating the score in the preferred embodiment, any type of item that can be purchased is considered a "product," including but not limited to physical goods, services, software, and downloadable content. In other embodiments, the products may be based on a more narrow definition of what constitutes a product. For example, by requiring or taking into

> account whether a web site includes information about shipping, non-physical
> items can be excluded from consideration or accorded a lesser weight. As
> depicted in FIG. 1, the product score 170 associated with each indexed web page
> is stored in the Product Spider Database 147. Alternatively, the web page entries
> could be grouped according to product score (e.g., top third, middle third, bottom
> third) without actually storing the score values. As a further refinement, the
> product scores could be generated and stored on a site-by-site basis rather than on
> a page-by-page basis.

This section of FORD et al. discloses generating the Product Spider database through the use of a web crawler that crawls web sites on the Internet while storing copies of located web pages. This section of FORD et al. does not disclose a news source, let alone a plurality of different news sources. Therefore, this section of FORD et al. does not disclose or suggest repeating the determining and generating for a plurality of other sources, at least one of the plurality of other sources including a different news source, and storing the quality values for the new source and the plurality of other sources, as recited in claim 21.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claim 21 is patentable over FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Claim 31 depends from claim 29. Therefore, claim 31 is patentable over FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 29. Moreover, claim 31 recites additional features not disclosed or suggested by FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al.

For example, claim 31 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 6. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 31 is patentable over FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, at least for reasons similar to the reasons given above

with respect to claim 6.

Claim 34 recites a method that includes receiving a search query; generating a ranked list of on-line news articles based on the search query; identifying a news source for at least one on-line news article of the ranked list of on-line news articles; determining, based on the identified news source, whether a source rank exists for the at least one on-line news article; and adjusting a ranking of the at least one on-line news article if the source rank exists for the at least one on-line news article. FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al. do not disclose or suggest determining, based on an identified news source, whether a source rank exists for at least one on-line news article. The Examiner relies on paragraphs 0020-0031 of DOGANATA et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 9). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of DOGANATA et al.

At paragraphs 0020-0031, DOGANATA et al. generally discloses categorizing a user query into a number of categories, where each category is associated with a ranked list of information sources. The categories allow a user query to be expanded into a number of keywords that can be used as query terms. This section of DOGANATA et al. does not disclose or suggest a source rank for an on-line news article. Therefore, this section of DOGANATA et al. cannot disclose or suggest determining, based on an identified news source, whether a source rank exists for at least one on-line news article, as recited in claim 34.

At paragraph 0069, DOGANATA et al. discloses:

FIG. 5 shows a representation of how information sources are scored and ranked. The information source A is scored based on all the keywords that represent the category of choice. In this example, there are four keywords, keyword, through keyword4, for the category being examined. The scores of source A are 50, 76, 55 and 20, for the four keywords, respectively. Each score is determined through method 400. Hence, the total score of source A is 201, which is a simple addition of each of the keyword scores, that ranks this source as the 3rd after source B and D. The rank is determined from the source scores; the higher the score, the lower the rank in this example (i.e., lower scores are better).

This section of DOGANATA et al. discloses scoring and ranking information sources based on keywords that represent a category of choice. This section of DOGANATA et al. does not disclose or suggest a source rank for an on-line news article. Therefore, this section of DOGANATA et al. cannot disclose or suggest determining, based on an identified news source, whether a source rank exists for at least one on-line news article, as recited in claim 34.

FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al. further do not disclose or suggest adjusting a ranking score of the at least one on-line news article if the source rank exists for the at least one on-line news article. The Examiner relies on paragraph 0143 of FORD et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 9). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of FORD et al.

At paragraph 0143, FORD et al. discloses:

In another embodiment, a set of weighting factors is applied to the set of category popularity scores. Such weighting factors may be used to help or hinder particular categories as desired. For example, if it was decided that during the holiday season the Flowers & Gifts category should be provided a competitive advantage, that category may be given a weighting factor of two, with each of the remaining categories having a weighting factor of one. With such a weighting set, the Software (score=1 x 90=90), Flowers & Gifts (score=2 x 70=140), and Packaged Travel (score=1 x 66=66) categories would now be ranked second, first, and third, respectively. These weighting factors may be influenced by the profile of the user who submitted the search query. Furthermore, the popularity scores may be influenced by the profile of the user who submits the search query. For example, the complete history of selections made by the user within the host web site 130 may be retained in a database (not shown in FIG. 1). This information may be used to adjust the weightings to further individualize the

> presentation. If the user has made 90% of her prior purchases on the host web site
> 130 from the Videos database 143, for example, the Videos category popularity
> scores may be given greater weight to reflect this individualized history.

This section of FORD et al. discloses applying a set of weighting factors that are

influenced by a user profile to a set of category popularity scores that are also influenced

by the user profile. This section of FORD et al. does not disclose or suggest a source

rank for an on-line news article. Therefore, this section of FORD et al. cannot disclose or

adjusting a ranking score of the at least one on-line news article if the source rank exists

for the at least one on-line news article, as recited in claim 34.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 34 is patentable

over FORD et al. and DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable

combination.

New claims 35 and 36 depend from claim 34, new claims 37 and 38 depend from

claim 10, new claims 39 and 40 depend from claim 27, and new claims 41-43 depend

from claim 28. Therefore, claims 35-43 are patentable over FORD et al. and

DOGANATA et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least

the reasons given above with respect to claims 10, 27, 28, and 34.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and the timely allowance of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /Meagan S. Walling, Reg. No. 60,112/
      Meagan S. Walling
      Reg. No. 60,112

Date: June 16, 2008

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Customer Number: 44989